

42390P10807

PATENT

REMARKS

The applicant respectfully presents Claims 1-36 for examination. The applicant respectfully submits that the claims and remarks presented herein overcome the rejections in the Final Office Action dated May 20, 2005 in the parent application.

Claims 1-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,530,860 ("Matsuura"). Matsuura describes a control program for assigning actual central processing units ("CPUs") to guest virtual machines ("VMs"). See column 5, line 67 to column 6, line 5.

The examiner argues that Matsuura, in column 10, lines 12-20 and lines 47-63 teaches trapping a change in execution among the VMs.

In contrast, the present invention, as set forth in amended claim 1, includes "trapping, by processor, a change in execution among schedulable entities running on a virtual machine." Matsuura does not describe trapping a change in execution among schedulable entities running on a virtual machine.

Therefore, Matsuura does not anticipate the invention as set forth in independent claim 1, or in any of independent claims 13, 25, or 35, each of which, as amended, include a limitation corresponding to trapping a change in execution among schedulable entities running on a virtual machine. Furthermore, Matsuura does not anticipate the invention as set forth in claims 2-12, 14-24, 26-34, or 36, because of the dependence of each of these claims on an independent claim that Matsuura does not anticipate.

Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-36 based on the examiner's argument of anticipation by Matsuura.

Claims 1, 11-13, 23-25, and 31-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,374,286 ("Gee"). Gee describes a processor running multiple Java virtual machines ("JVMs"), with each JVM operating in a separate time slice called a partition. Each partition is "allotted a fixed period of time in which to operate, and, at the end of the allotted time, a context switch is forced to another JVM operating in the next partition." See Gee's Abstract.

42390P10807

PATENT

The examiner argues that Gee's Abstract teaches trapping a change in execution among the JVMs.

In contrast, the present invention, as set forth in amended claim 1, includes "trapping, by processor, a change in execution among schedulable entities running on a virtual machine." Gee does not describe trapping a change in execution among schedulable entities running on a virtual machine. Therefore, Gee does not anticipate the invention as set forth in independent claim 1, or in any of independent claims 13 or 25, each of which, as amended, include a limitation corresponding to trapping a change in execution among schedulable entities running on a virtual machine. Furthermore, Gee does not anticipate the invention as set forth in claims 11, 12, 23, 24, or 31-34, because of the dependence of each of these claims on an independent claim that Gee does not anticipate.

Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 11-13, 23-25, and 31-34 based on the examiner's argument of anticipation by Gee.

42390P10807


PATENT

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the applicants respectfully submit that all of the examiner's rejections have been overcome, and that claims 1-36 are in condition for allowance. The applicants therefore respectfully request the issuance of a Notice of Allowance. Please charge any necessary fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 22, 2005



Thomas R. Lane
Registration No. 42,781